

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 94 04:30:19 PDT
From: Ham-Digital Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-digital@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Digital-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V94 #172
To: Ham-Digital

Ham-Digital Digest Thu, 2 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 172

Today's Topics:

Alpha-Numeric Paging Software
An open note to Gary Coffman, KE4ZV (3 msgs)
Cardinal DSP16 boards \$79 +\$5s/h (2 msgs)
Help with JNOS for Linux
JNOS for Unix.
LOOKING FOR: PK-88
need repeater advice
PCMCIA TNC
RTTY DIGITAL JOURNAL subscription info
Telix modem software doesn't choke on 7plus files

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Digital-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Digital Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-digital".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 1 Jun 1994 22:50:57 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!udel!news2.sprintlink.net!
news.sprintlink.net!bga.com!patm@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Alpha-Numeric Paging Software
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

TSTADER (tstader@aol.com) wrote:
: In article <2rt9s2\$mpr@giga.bga.com>, patm@bga.com (Patrick McGuire)
: writes:

*** Thanks for the credit but I this is **not** the response that I posted.***

[illegible]

Patrick McGuire WA8PLR
patm@bga.com

Date: 1 Jun 1994 15:25:57 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.uiowa.edu!icaen!drenze@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: An open note to Gary Coffman, KE4ZV
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Gary, you should be getting a copy of this on Packet as well, but I thought I'd toss it out on Usenet as well for others to comment upon.

I recently came across a note by you in our local Packet BBS archives dated 12-MAR-92. You probably don't remember having written it, but it was a response to a UK user's request for information on packet applications.

Your response was that there was so much potential for packet, but that right now, aside from local packet BBS's and packet mail, there are none, diddly, zippo. You said that, you expected it "to fall into a 1200 baud and C64 forever mindset that never reaches the heights it is capable of scaling."

Well, two years later, I see you as being 100% right. I've not been in packet that long, but what I've seen makes me believe that the case may be worse than you depicted it then. I'll use the Iowa packet network as an example. It's a fairly extensive network, you can get into it from pretty much anyplace in the state on 2-meters. But I have the network map here in front of me...and that's about all it is, 2 meters. There are only a handful of 9600 baud connections throughout the state, and those are mostly to get *into* nodes, not links between the nodes, and the few which are backbone links don't even connect the major nodes. I hear people talking on the linked repeater system about mail moving "fast" today--only taking 16 hours or so to make a 3-link trip. Needless to say, I have a hard time swallowing that.

I realize that much of this is simply the way the local net is set up, but the way it is set up reflects the mindset of which you wrote. Also, from my conversations with other packeteers, this sort of setup is not uncommon.

But what can be done about it? It seems to me that newer, more efficient protocols need to be developed *and actively promoted* rather than making 10 or 15-year-old technology the standard.

A new implementation of TCP/IP might even help the situation. While the TCP/IP protocol suite is far from perfect, it seems to be much more efficient than the network we have now. But the current implementations, while pioneering in their time, are currently out-

dated. IMO the best way to update our current technology would be to develop a device driver for the standard TNC in KISS mode. This device driver would allow standard TCP/IP implementations and apps to interface to amateur packet radio transparently. It seems to me that there is no reason that standard TCP/IP applications which run on the Internet should not be able to run on a Packet radio internet, including standard implementations of ftp, telnet, rlogin, usenet news, internet bbs's, etc. I have been dabbling with such a device driver, but I do not pretend to either be a professional programmer (I'm a writer by trade) or to understand the AX.25 protocol or to understand KISS.

Furthermore, this would be an excellent avenue to bring new blood into Amateur Radio. I've mostly grown up with computers, but as great as my understanding of them is, I don't have the intuitive understanding that those even ten years younger than me do. I've only been using computers since I was ten or so...these kids currently in high school have been living with their wonders since the day they were born. These are the ones we should be talking to, that we should be bringing into Amateur Radio to develop the networks of tomorrow. With their help we could put Amateur Radio back on the cutting edge of technology rather than the trailing edge we seem to be holding on to right now.

Comments? I'm interested in hearing what people have to say. You can please direct any flames to /dev/null--I don't want to hear them.

--

Doug Renze, NOYVW * drenze@isca.uiowa.edu * NOYVW @ WOIUQ.ia.usa.na

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 1994 00:24:25 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
darwin.sura.net!fconvx.ncifcrf.gov!mack@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: An open note to Gary Coffman, KE4ZV
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In article <2si9a5\$40g@news.icaen.uiowa.edu> drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu (Douglas J Renze) writes:

> But what can be done about it? It seems to me that newer,
> more efficient protocols need to be developed *and actively promoted*
> rather than making 10 or 15-year-old technology the standard.
> A new implementation of TCP/IP might even help the situation.
> While the TCP/IP protocol suite is far from perfect, it seems to be
> much more efficient than the network we have now. But the current
> implementations, while pioneering in their time, are currently out-
> dated. IMO the best way to update our current technology would be

>to develop a device driver for the standard TNC in KISS mode. This
>device driver would allow standard TCP/IP implementations and apps
>to interface to amateur packet radio transparently. It seems to me
>that there is no reason that standard TCP/IP applications which run
>on the Internet should not be able to run on a Packet radio internet,
>including standard implementations of ftp, telnet, rlogin, usenet news,
>internet bbs's, etc.

TCPIP is already available with the KA9Q NOS code (there's lots of books
eg NOS INTRO, thru ARRL, to help you on your way). There is a problem that
there's no one to talk to. The real problem is that increased data rate
requires a wider IF and AF section in the T/X. The current voice grade
audio that comes through ham FM rigs is only good to about 2400 baud (others
probably have better estimates). If you want 56kb, then you need a whole
new TX, basically an RF modem. To talk at ethernet rates (10MHz) you are
going to have to put all your rigs on 10Ghz. It's a lot of money to invest
in a system which is hobbled by every message having to be read by a human
at the point of entry.

Joe Mack NA3T
mack@ncifcrf.gov

Date: 2 Jun 1994 04:36:06 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.uiowa.edu!icaen!drenze@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: An open note to Gary Coffman, KE4ZV
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

mack@ncifcrf.gov (Joe Mack) writes:

>In article <2si9a5\$40g@news.icaen.uiowa.edu> drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu (Douglas J
Renze) writes:

>> But what can be done about it? It seems to me that newer,
>>more efficient protocols need to be developed *and actively promoted*
>>rather than making 10 or 15-year-old technology the standard.
>> A new implementation of TCP/IP might even help the situation.
>>While the TCP/IP protocol suite is far from perfect, it seems to be
>>much more efficient than the network we have now. But the current
>>implementations, while pioneering in their time, are currently out-
>>dated. IMO the best way to update our current technology would be
>>to develop a device driver for the standard TNC in KISS mode. This
>>device driver would allow standard TCP/IP implementations and apps
>>to interface to amateur packet radio transparently. It seems to me
>>that there is no reason that standard TCP/IP applications which run
>>on the Internet should not be able to run on a Packet radio internet,

>>including standard implementations of ftp, telnet, rlogin, usenet news,
>>internet bbs's, etc.

>TCPIP is already available with the KA9Q NOS code (there's lots of books
>eg NOS INTRO, thru ARRL, to help you on your way). There is a problem that
>there's no one to talk to. The real problem is that increased data rate
>requires a wider IF and AF section in the T/X. The current voice grade
>audio that comes through ham FM rigs is only good to about 2400 baud (others
>probably have better estimates). If you want 56kb, then you need a whole
>new TX, basically an RF modem. To talk at ethernet rates (10MHz) you are
>going to have to put all your rigs on 10Ghz. It's a lot of money to invest
>in a system which is hobbled by every message having to be read by a human
>at the point of entry.

I'm aware that TCP/IP is already available. But this is a suite of
programs which operate only through packet, if I'm not mistaken. Ideally,
any program which can run through standard TCP/IP should be able to run
through a packet-radio version of TCP/IP. As far as I know, this is not
currently the case. If I'm using a Macintosh, for example, and want to
use TCP/IP I *ought* to be able to use NCSA telnet, ditto for Windoze,
standard telnet should work for me on a Linux box, and the DOS version
of it should work on a DOS box. Understand what I'm saying?

And who said anything about Ethernet rates? Seems to me that
a lot of people run SLIP at 9600 baud and don't have many problems. Heck,
I've even heard the rumour that all of Iceland is linked to the rest of
the Internet through a single 9600 baud SLIP link. Similar performance
should be possible via packet (I mean, if LANs can do it, why can't we?).
A packet network should be treatable as a WAN.

I've also been thinking some more about some applications for Packet.
Why don't we use a Client-Server architecture for our BBS's? It's much
more efficient both in the use of the frequency and in the use of the
host computer.

Why not write distributed BBS's, where multiple computers at
different sites share the loads? This is an offshoot of the client-
server architecture.

There are so many possibilities!

73 - doug

--

Doug Renze, N0YVW * drenze@isca.uiowa.edu * N0YVW @ W0IUQ.ia.usa.na
DRenze@aol.com ** drenze@chop.isca.uiowa.edu

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 21:52:24 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!analog.com!

In article <1994Jun1.215224.4951@analog.com>, matt.kangas@analog.com writes:

In article <CqJDL1.JEv@sunsrvr6.cci.com> jdc@cci.com (James D. Cronin) writes:

>In article <1994May27.185206.22868@midway.uchicago.edu>,

>Kenneth C Hopper <khopper@midway.uchicago.edu> wrote:

>> For those digitally enabled hams who are in-
>> terested in exploring the KC7WW PC soundcard
>> application - you can get a Cardinal DSP16 for
>> \$79 at the PC Connection 1-800-243-8088 plus
>> about \$5 s/h. Good deal for a programmable
>> ASP based DSP PC board.

>>

>It sounds interesting. What's needed in the line of software for
>programming it? Is there a developer's kit or something of that
>nature?

>Also, what ham-oriented software has been written for this card?

A friend and I bought 3 of these boards several months ago they were such a "bargain" (about \$120).

We had so many problems with software and drivers and installation, we sent them back! Cardinal Tech Support was useless.

Sometimes you get what you pay for!

Anyone need the Wavetable Chip for this Board??

Date: 1 Jun 1994 21:37:03 -0400

From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Help with JNOS for Linux

To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Benn trying to get JNOS (j1091xa3) working. When I compile, everything goes fine until it gets near the end, then I get "curses.c XXX (linux.a(curses.o)) Undefined symbol _getattrs referenced from text segment"

This is repeated 5 times, with 5 line numbers (XXX), 434,489,496,524, 533) . I loaded ncurses 1.8, and even changed my kernel from 99.14 to 1.10, but the error is the same.

Obviously, I am no expert on C programming. Has anyone had the same experience, and can tell me what to do. Dumb I may be, bur also stubborn, and have benn struggling with this for 3 days.

Thanks in advance..

John N4JS (jsielke@wx2l.uscc.com)

Date: 1 Jun 1994 14:24:02 -0400
From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: JNOS for Unix.
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Try UCSD.EDU in hmradio/packet/jnos. You want j1091xa3.tar.z

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 14:55:42 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!concert!
hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!saips.cv.nrao.edu!sadira.gb.nrao.edu!
dgordon@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: LOOKING FOR: PK-88
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

I am looking for a used PK-88 for use with my C64. Got the software, just need the modem and cables. Thanks

David - KB4LCI
dgordon@nrao.edu

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 20:01:45 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!dtsdev0!kinzer@uunet.uu.net
Subject: need repeater advice
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

There seems to be very little packet activity in this area (Phoenix) on 440 MHZ. Around our club, we were kicking around the idea of putting up a small BBS or something, just to get our hands into the packet arena. The idea kept evolving until we found ourselves talking about putting up a full blown repeater for digital use (we already have voice repeaters.) We think we can scrounge up the necessary radio equipment, and are continuing thinking along these lines.

So, with setting up a repeater as the goal, what do we need to do to make a deluxe installation? I see operation at 9600 baud as a possibility, even though I (nor nobody I know) does 9600 at the present time. We would probably be setting a precedent for the area on 440, and thus should do the job well.

There appears to be a bit-regenerator kit from TAPR, but I am not networked well with that organization yet (new member.) Is this the way to go, or is there some other option to consider? Anyway, fire away, and we'll see what we can come up with.

-dave

Date: 1 Jun 1994 22:42:32 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!usenet@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: PCMCIA TNC
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Anyone know if someone is looking at doing a PCMCIA TNC? I think that this would be a neat item. (I know I could put it to good use).

Any pointers would be appreciated.

73 de Jeff -- KD1IT/7

Jeff McLeman
mcleman@zso.dec.com
Redmond, Wa.
jeffm@kd1it.ampr.org
KD1IT / 7
slownet: kd1it@n7fsp.wa.usa.na

Internet:

Ampnet:

AX25

Date: 1 Jun 1994 14:56:18 GMT
From: nwnexus!krel.iea.com!comtch!mikec@uunet.uu.net
Subject: RTTY DIGITAL JOURNAL subscription info
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Kenneth C Hopper (khopper@kimbark.uchicago.edu) wrote:
: Great source of info about all digital ham modes. Give it
: a try for \$19 (first class US)/yr.

: The rtty DIGITAL Jouranl
: c/o The American Digital Radio Society
: P.O. Box 2465
: New York, NY 10185-2465

: or Jim, N2HOS

: P.O. Box 3328
: Indian Rocks Beach, FL 34635

: I am not affiliated with the RDJ in any way - but I feel
: it is the digital ham's best publication and I want you
: to know about it :-).

I _am_ affiliated with the RDJ, and I have to agree with you -
the Journal is an excellent source of digital information!

--

- - - - - mikec@comtch.iea.com - - - - -

Michael B. Candy
P.O. Box 1953
Airway Hts, WA. 99001-1953

Amateur Radio Call: KI7FX
KI7FX@KA7FVV.#EWA.WA.USA.NA
American Digital Radio Society

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 11:36:18 GMT
From: psinntp!gdstech!gdstech!bat@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Telix modem software doesn't choke on 7plus files
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Any time you are sending binary files over a modem you run the risk
of wierd things happening, as the XON/XOF characters are encountered
in
the stream. Using hardware flow control is almost always a better bet.
Set your comm software (and sometimes a modem setting is needed) to
use
RTS/CTs and you will have lots fewer transmission problems. BTW, I use
the new MSKermit, and it works great, and is free. -pat

--

* Pat Masterson D12-25 | KE2LJ@KC2FD *
* Grumman Data Systems | 516-346-6316. *
* Bethpage, NY 11746 | bat@gdstech.grumman.com *

End of Ham-Digital Digest V94 #172
